International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education 2018, Volume 30, Number 1, 91-104
http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/ ISSN 1812-9129

Students' Perceptions Towards Teachers' and Students' Academic Impoliteness

Mohammad Aliakbari and Anna Hajizadeh
Ilam University

There seems to be a diversity of opinions regarding the construct-relevant definition of impoliteness. Currently, it has been defined with reference to its occurrence in specific contexts. Universities are among those places where incivility is growing rapidly. Both students' and instructors' impolite behavior have been seen as a serious problem that highly interferes with the goals of education. Hence, the current study attempts to examine Iranian university students' perception of instructors' and students' uncivil behavior. The results indicated that academic incivility can be recognized a verbal, non-verbal, and/or as a combination of both. This study creates awareness about academic impoliteness especially in Iranian contexts and it might be a step towards tackling it.

In the field of linguistics, the word "impoliteness" is a fairly new research topic which has not yet gained as much attention as politeness. However, currently the study of impoliteness has attracted considerable recent attention among scholars (Bousfield, 2008; Culpeper, 2005, 2010; Limberg, 2009) who now endeavor to study the notion of impoliteness more thoroughly than before. Given the limited literature, the first challenge is how to define impoliteness. According to Jamet and Jobert (2013), the term impoliteness causes confusion as it is not easy to distinguish between social impoliteness and linguistic impoliteness. Consequently, there have been numerous attempts to define impoliteness. As Tannen (1990) maintains, crucial to proposing a definition is the understanding that people have diverse conceptualizations regarding impolite behavior. Given scholars' categorization of impoliteness as a culturally specific notion (Strecker, 1993), various definitions emerged. Culpeper (1996), for instance, believes that impoliteness is the opposite of politeness, thus being consistent with what Eelen (2001) declared: that politeness and impoliteness are two sides of a coin.

Although various attempts have been made to theorize politeness, there is a lack of attention towards impoliteness in literature. Many scholars have used the notion of impoliteness to theorize politeness. For instance, Watts (2003) argues that impolite behavior is a distinguishable form of social behavior since it is opposite to appropriate social behavior. The notion of impoliteness has been traditionally examined by focusing on single politeness or impoliteness strategies (see, for example, Brown & Levinson 1987; Lachenicht, 1980; Turner, 1996). In the traditional approach, impoliteness is defined as "strategic" (Lakoff, 1989) or "instrumental" (Beebe, 1995), denoting "a function that the speaker intended, and was not failed politeness" (Beebe, 1995, p.166). Accordingly, impoliteness has been defined by referring to those actions that might damage the image of the speaker. For instance, according to Goffman (1967, p. 14), three types of action can constitute a threat to image are:

a) the offending person may appear to have acted maliciously and spitefully, with the intention of causing open insult;
b) there are incidental offences; these arise as an unplanned but sometimes anticipated by-product of action—action the offender performs in spite of its offensive consequences, though not out of spite; and
c) the offending person may appear to have acted innocently, and his offence seems to be unintended and unwitting.

Many scholars (Austin, 1990; Bousfield, 2008; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Culpeper, 1996, 2005 & 2010; Lachenicht, 1980; Leech, 1983; Turner, 1996) have postulated, criticized, revised, proposed, and maintained a traditional impoliteness framework based on the initial theme proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). As Watts (2003) argues, there has been a lack of consensus regarding the notion of politeness and impoliteness and it is highly expected that there won't be an agreed upon conceptualization of the two terms in the future either. Accordingly, scholars have examined impoliteness from various standpoints which result in incompatible interpretations. Accordingly, some contexts have been proved to be more likely to host the impolite behaviors, for instance, everyday conversation (Beebe, 1995), workplace discourse (Andersson & Pearson, 1999), and courtroom discourse (Penman, 1990). As a result, more attention has been devoted to the realization of impoliteness in extended discourse. For instance, army training discourse (Culpeper, 1996), family discourse (Vuchinich, 1990), doctor-patient discourse (Aronson & Rundstrom, 1989), parliamentary discourse (Harris, 2001), radio talk shows (Hutchby, 1996), adolescent discourse (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1990), legal discourse (Archer, 2011), impoliteness in literary works (Brown & Gilman, 1989; Ermida, 2006; Metthias, 2011), impoliteness in email communication and commerce (Cehjnová, 2014; Wolf, 2011), and finally in informal settings and ordinary conversations

(Ermida, 2006; Harris, 2001; Myers, 1989). One of the areas that impoliteness is highly increasing is higher educational contexts (Boice, 1996; Hernandez & Fister, 2001; Seidman, 2005; Twale & DeLuca, 2008). Academic contexts are among those where disruptive behavior is beginning to grow quickly. Incivility can be defined as any destructive behavior causing distress in others. Over the past few decades, incivility has been observed as a problem at the primary, secondary, and high school levels; however, recently it has been also observed at the higher education level (Ausbrooks, Jones & Tijeriana, 2011; Clark, 2008; Clark et al., 2012; Knepp, 2012; Wei, 2010). Both students, to a large extent, and instructors, to some extent, are getting accustomed to improper behavior in a way that is becoming a serious problem at universities and consequently will interfere with the goals of education. Since the immediate objective of education is to increase civility and respect in society (Mirhaghi & Shomoossi, 2015), disrespectful behavior should not be encouraged. In fact, according to Clark and Carnosso (2008) ignoring such actions will lead to the emergence of a threatening situation. A further definition of incivility has been proposed by Clark and Kenaley (2011) in which impoliteness is assumed to be any speech or behavior that threaten *any member* of the educational contexts. By italicizing *any member* in this definition, it can be inferred that incivility can take multiple dimensions: students to students, students to instructors, students to personnel, instructors to instructors, instructors to students, instructors to personnel, personnel to personnel, personnel to students, and personnel to instructors. Hence, a serious concern is felt with the growing number of disrespectful behaviors being observed by either students or instructors in an academic contexts where the ultimate goal is to expand knowledge for the benefit of mankind. As a result, it seems most essential to identify and define disrespectful behavior in such contexts and then endeavor to eliminate even the slightest signs of such manner at universities.

Literature Review

Incivility, in a general term, refers to any "speech or action that is disrespectful or rude" (Berger, 2000, p. 446). These behaviors are more vividly observed after the mid-1980s and are widespread among students. A lack of courteous types of behavior begins at the high school levels and continues and intensifies at the university level. According to Leatherman (1996) and Baldwin (1997), universities also widely blamed for causing the latest incivility due to inappropriate response to such behaviors. In fact, the only response produces by universities to students' improper behavior is the sanction of some of the offensive behaviors. Furthermore, as universities grow in size and number of students, they have adopted a rather impersonal and indifferent social setting (Baldwin, 1997; Leatherman, 1996). An account of disrespectful behavior in academic contexts can be any rude and disrespectful speech or behavior that causes problems in the academic environment (Feldmann, 2001). More recently, Robertson (2012) defines it as intentional behavior aiming at disrupting the teaching and learning processes. The Center for Survey Research at Indiana University (2000) provides a more specific description of incivility related to the academic contexts by defining it as "…. behaviors that distract the instructor or other students, disrupt classroom learning, discourage the instructor from teaching, [and] discourage other students from participating…." (in Bjorklund & Rehling, 2010). Recently, attempts have been made to categorize academic incivility. For example, Feldman (2001) put the concept into four categories: classroom terrorism, simple annoyances, threat of violence, and intimidation. By "classroom terrorism," Feldman (2001, p. 137) means that any behavior which can affect teaching and learning processes is an example of academic incivility. The second one is called simple annoyances, which refers to concepts such as clothing and class performance. The third type refers to any act of violence against a faculty member or other students. Finally, Feldman's last category of impropet academic behavior is known as intimidation that "manifested itself when students threatened to go to the dean or department head about the instructor's teaching or grading practices" (McKinne, 2008, p.27). Furthermore, covert behavior, such as sleeping, and overt behavior, such as arguing with instructors (Meyers, 2003; Seidman, 2005), as well as serious or non-serious incivility (Connelly, 2009), are other types of disrespectful behavior. There is much discussion in the literature pertaining to the emergence of uncivil behavior among students at higher educational level (Boice, 1996; Braxton & Bayer, 1999; Clark & Springer, 2007; Gonzales & Lopez, 2001; Luparell, 2003; Schneider, 1998; Thomas, 2003). For example, Royce's (2000) Survey on academic incivility shows that instructors identified the following behaviors as "incivilities": 1) arriving late to class; 2) noisily packing up early; 3) leaving early; 4) talking in class; 5) coming to class unprepared; 6) repeating questions; 7) eating in class; 8) acting bored or apathetic; 9) groaning disapprovingly; 10) making sarcastic remarks or gestures; 11) sleeping in class; 12) inattention; 13) not answering a direct question; 14) using a computer in class for non-class purposes; 15) letting cell phones and pagers go off; 16) cutting class habitually; 17) dominating discussion; 18) demanding make-up exams, extensions, grade changes, or other special favors; 19) taunting or belittling other students;

20) challenging the instructor's knowledge or credibility; 21) making harassing, hostile, or vulgar comments to the instructor in or out of class; 22) sending the instructor inappropriate emails; and 23) making threats of physical harm to the instructor. Similarly, Bjorklund and Rehling (2010) portrayed uncivil student behavior as ranging from using alcohol or any other drugs to coming late to the class.

Other groups of studies attempted to examine unintended impolite behaviors (see for example Kasper 1990; Scollon & Scollon, 1995). They studied impoliteness based on the analyses of communication across cultures. Accordingly, it was shown that uncivil behaviors are likely to occur more frequently in multi-cultural contexts and among various language groups (Cheng 2003; Harris, 2001). On the whole, as one reviews the literature on instances of incivility in higher education, similar cases emerge in explaining such behavior from various standpoints. For instance, using cell phone in class (Boice, 1996; Feldman, 2001; Hernandez & Fister, 2001; Jere, 2015; McKinne, 2008; Meyers, 2003; Royce, 2000; Seidman, 2005), using technological devices for any purposes other than education (Alberts, Hazen, & Theobald, 2010; Clark, 2008; Jere, 2015; McKinne, 2008; Nordstrom, Bartels & Bucy, 2009; Peck, 2002), holding a disruptive dialog (Alberts et al., 2010; Boice, 1996; Clark, 2008; Feldman, 2001; Hernandez & Fister, 2001; Meyers, 2003; Nordstrom et al., 2009; Royce, 2000; Seidman, 2005), leaving class early (Alberts et al., 2010; Boice, 1996; Clark, 2008; Feldman, 2001; Hernandez & Fister, 2001; Meyers, 2003; Nordstrom et al., 2009; Peck, 2002; Royce, 2000; Seidman, 2005), being unprepared for class (Royce, 2000), and making sarcastic comments (Alberts et al., 2010; Clark, 2008; Nordstrom et al., 2009; Peck, 2002) are frequently reported as improper behavior in educational contexts.

Although scholars have constantly listed a huge list of impolite behavior, some claim it is not easy to define (Gilroy, 2008). Hence, bearing in mind the diversity involved regarding the conceptualization of impolite behaviors, it can thus be inferred that some completely polite behaviors in one context can be assumed as impolite in another context. For example, Jamet and Jobert (2013) argue that in a German context, directness is politeness. Similarly, avoiding eye contact in Zulu context is a sign of politeness (Chick, 1996, Gough, 1995), whereas the same is assumed to be an impolite behavior in British-South African Culture (Ige, 2001). This subjectivity (Alberts et al., 2010) also pertains to labeling impoliteness as severe or non-severe in a way that there is a high possibility that one instructor could consider a specific behavior as rude while the other may not feel any harm (Connelly, 2009).

Scholars have reached a consensus regarding the rise of incivility in academic contexts (Alberts et al., 2010; Bjorklund & Rehling; 2010; Boice, 1996; Feldman, 2001; Gilroy, 2008; McKinne, 2008; Meyers, 2003; Seidman, 2005; Twale & DeLuca, 2008). Accordingly, the majority of studies have focused on students' perceptions towards disrespectful behavior at universities. Given the lack of studies on classroom incivility (Boice 1996; Braxton, Bayer & Noseworthy, 2004) and lack of objectivity in the available works (Alberts et al., 2010; Boice, 1996; Clark, 2008), it seems inadequate to limit this study only to students' incivility as there is little, if any, study that examines instructors' impoliteness in the Iranian context. Furthermore, bearing in mind that classroom incivility includes any unprofessional behaviors that may occur by both teachers and students, the current study aims to examine students' perception towards instructors' and students' improper behavior. Taking into account the cultural differences, the present study examines the conceptualization of incivility among Iranian university students. Hence, the following research questions are posed:

What is the Iranian university students' perception towards students' academic incivility?

How do the Iranian university students define instructors' impolite behaviors?

Method

Participants and Procedure

A total number of 114 university students (59 females and 55 males) participated in the study. They were studying in different departments from eight different provinces of Iran (Tehran, Alborz, Ilam, Esfihan, Shiraz, Bandar Abbas, Kermanshah, and Gilan). Participants were asked to write 10 cases and examples of impolite behavior from students towards teachers or other students and 10 cases from teachers to students or other teachers at universities. Attempts were made to be completely unbiased towards the instances of impolite behavior. Hence, there was no prior suggested category nor any example. The rationale for not giving any example or category was for students to come up with instances of impoliteness free from any biases. They were informed that they could even write their personal experiences or their personal observation of uncivil behavior in academic contexts. The data collection procedures lasted around a whole semester as participants ranged from different provinces of Iran.

Analysis

According to the qualitative nature of the study, content analysis was applied to analyze participants' comments regarding impoliteness. As Fraenkel and

Table 1
Distribution of Students' Non-Verbal Academic Impolite Behavior among Both Genders

Non-verbal			Female		Male		Total	
1			F	%	F	%	F	%
		Lack of attention to teacher, lesson, class and assignment	35	57.37	26	42.62	61	100
	Lack of attention	Coming to class late or after the teacher	27	62.79	16	37.20	43	100
		Not listening to the teacher while teaching	19	63.33	11	36.66	30	100
		leaving the class without teachers' permission	19	63.33	11	36.66	30	100
		Total	100	60.97	64	39.02	164	100
2	Cell phone		22	48.88	23	51.11	45	100
3	Inappropriate dress		9	40.90	13	59.09	22	100
4	Not to stand up to a teacher		8	44.44	10	55.55	18	100
5	Yawning and sleeping in class		6	35.29	11	64.70	17	100
6	Ignoring ethical and moral values		5	33.33	10	66.66	15	100
7	Inappropriate sitting or perching in the class		8	80	2	20	10	100
	Total		158	54.29	133	45.70	291	100

Wallen (2006) maintain, content analysis is a reliable approach to examine those objects of research which are not directly observable. Although there is consensus among scholars regarding the application of content analysis (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006), yet what lies ahead as a concern is the usage of an appropriate method in converting raw data into relevant themes. According to Strauss (1987), grounded theory analysis (GTA) is an approach in exploring the content when the researcher does not have any prior assumptions regarding the research topic as data are not collected prior to any former conclusion. As a result, there is a possibility of theory formation (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) out of the gathered data. Hence, the procedures of GTA, including three stages, were followed. The initial stage is called open coding and basically includes the delineation of basic ideas and then placement of them in categories (Given, 2008). After breaking down the data, this stage is followed by the axial coding where the researcher re-reads the data (Strauss, 1987) to situate interrelated themes under the same subcategories (Given, 2008). And finally, in the third phase, known as selective coding, a central theme is chosen by the researchers to help them to incorporate the main categories and develop empirically grounded theory (Given, 2008).

Results

The analysis of the data provided a total number of 1294 cases of impoliteness with the distribution of 556 cases related to student to teacher and other students and 738 cases related to teacher to students and other teachers. Each is discussed in detail below.

Students' Perception of Students' Academic Impoliteness

A total number of 556 excerpts emerged and were put into three groups: non-verbal (291cases), verbal (192 cases), and verbal and non-verbal (73 cases).

Students' non-verbal academic impoliteness. Non-verbal impolite cases include those behaviors that are performed by gesture, eye contact, violates the class norms, etc. Seven subcategories emerged out of 291 cases.

Category one: Lack of attention. *Lack of attention* ranks as the first category (164 cases) of non-verbal students' impolite behavior with a rather different distribution among females (100 cases) and males (64 cases). A careful examination of this category shows that four subcategories can emerge. They include "lack of attention to teacher, lesson, class and assignment" (61 cases), "coming to class late or after the teacher" (43 cases), "not listening to the teacher while teaching" (30 cases), and finally "leaving the class without teachers' permission" (30 cases). Of interest is that in all subcategories, the number of the cases observed by females was more than those observed by males.

Category two: Cell phone use. Cell phone use is the second category of students' academic impolite behavior. It refers to the situations when students use their cell phones in the class, the times they play with their cell phones, and even times when their cell phones ring in the middle of the class. According to the Table 1, out of 291 cases related to non-verbal academic impoliteness, 45 cases refer to the use of a cell phone in the class. A gender-wise comparison demonstrates that both equally (22 females and 23 males) assumed cell

Table 2
Distribution of Students' Verbal Academic Impolite Behavior among Both Genders

Verbal		Female		Male		Total	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Not being quiet in class	36	59.01	25	40.98	61	100
2	Joking with the professors and giving nicknames to them	13	40.62	19	59.37	32	100
3	Lack of modesty in speech and using impolite words	15	48.38	16	51.61	31	100
4	Interrupting professor's speech	12	57.14	9	42.85	21	100
5	Talking loud with the professor	17	85	3	15	20	100
6	Talking behind the professor's back	8	44.44	10	55.55	18	100
7	Asking inappropriate personal and irrelevant questions	3	33.33	6	66.66	9	100
		104	54.16	88	45.83	192	

phone use as a non-verbal impolite behavior in academic contexts.

Category three: Inappropriate dress. Inappropriate dress is the third category of non-verbal impolite behavior. Participants' comments show that the category of inappropriate dress is basically related to those situations when university candidates wear clothes that violate the social norms of academic contexts. Twenty-two out of 291 non-verbal cases were related to academically unsuitable dressing. Interestingly, more males (13 cases) tended to choose this category as impolite behavior than females (9 cases) did. Subjects noted that university students have to respect the academic dignity of the university by wearing clothes appropriate for the educational contexts.

Category four: Not standing up for a teacher. Not standing up for a teacher is another theme related to academic incivility. In Iranian academic contexts, students stand up when a teacher enters to the class. This action has been taught to students from the early days in primary school to the higher university levels. For that reason, Iranian students believe it is a sign of impolite behavior if a teacher enters the class while students remain seated. As shown in Table 1, 18 cases (8 females and 10 males) were compelled to express such thoughts.

Category five: Yawning and sleeping in the class. Yawning and sleeping in the class, although not very central, refers to a non-verbal uncivil behavior. It refers to those situations when students are not fresh in the class: they yawn or sleep as the teacher begins to teach the new lessons. According to Table 1, this category encompasses 17 cases where males (11 cases) have chosen this category two times more than females (6 cases).

Category six: Ignoring ethical and moral values. Ignoring ethical and moral values is among the least non-verbal impolite actions. This theme is basically related to those instances when students try to make any relationship with their teachers beyond the student-teacher relationship. Candidates claim that any attempts to establish romantic relationships with teachers are seen as signs of non-verbal academic impolite behavior. As can be seen from Table 1, 15 cases refer to this type of incivility. Similar to the previous category, males (10 cases) tend to choose ignoring ethical and moral values two times more than females (5 cases).

Category seven: Inappropriate sitting or perching in the class. Inappropriate sitting or perching in the class is the least uttered case for impolite behavior. The study shows that any sitting in the class such as back sitting, down sitting, or any perching except the conventional way is considered as a sign of disrespectful behavior. According to Table 1, although a limited number of cases (10 cases) refer to inappropriate perching on the university chairs, it is interesting to note in that in contrast to the previous cases, more females (8 cases) tend to be more concerned with this category than males (2 cases).

Students' verbal academic impoliteness. The second group of students' improper academic behaviors refers to only verbal or spoken instances. This category analyzes the impoliteness from linguistic points of view and encompasses seven subcategories driven from 192 codes.

Category one: Not being quiet in class. Not being quiet in class ranks as the highest verbal uncivil behavior. This is associated with those situations when students talk in the middle of class and do not keep silent. According to Table 2, 61 out of 192 cases are related to students' noisiness in the class. Additionally, it can be seen that females (36 cases) are more concerned with this category than males (25 cases).

Category two: Joking with the professors and giving nicknames to them. Joking with the professors and giving nicknames to them is the second improper verbal behavior. Students believe that they are not allowed to joke with instructors and make fun of them. In fact, it was declared that any spoken word beyond the respectful lines of behavior—such as giving nicknames to teachers, mispronouncing their names intentionally, imitating their voices, etc.—are strongly viewed as serious acts of impoliteness. As shown in Table 2, a total number of 32 codes refer to this type of disrespectful

Table 3
Distribution of Students' Verbal and Non-Verbal Academic Impolite Behaviors among Both Genders

Verbal and Behavioral		Female		Male		Total	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Joking with the students and professor in the class	34	46.57	39	53.42	73	100

Table 4
Distribution of Teachers' Non-Verbal Academic Impolite Behavior among Both Genders

Non-verbal			Female		Male		Total	
1			F	%	F	%	F	%
	Lack of attention	Ignoring student's opinion	19	41.30	27	59.69	46	100
		Absence without prior notice	5	20	20	80	25	100
		The mismatch between teaching and testing	8	50	8	50	16	100
		rejecting criticism	3	21.42	11	78.57	14	100
		Coming late to the class	8	61.53	5	38.46	13	100
		Too many absences	8	66.66	4	33.33	12	100
		Leaving the classroom early	2	33.33	4	66.66	6	100
		Inattention to students' activities in classroom	1	16.66	5	83.33	6	100
		not recording student class attendance	0	0	3	100	3	100
		Total	54	38.29	87	61.70	141	100
2	Discrimination among students		13	35.13	24	64.86	37	100
3	Using cellphone in the classroom		12	36.36	21	63.63	33	100
4	Eating and drinking in the classroom		9	37.5	15	62.5	24	100
5	Ignoring ethical and moral values		6	40	9	60	15	100
	Total		94	37.60	156	62.40	250	100

behavior. In drawing a comparison among genders, the study indicates that compared to females (13 cases), more male participants (19 cases) believe that making fun of the professors is a major sign of impoliteness.

Category three: Lack of modesty in speech and using impolite words. Lack of modesty in speech and using impolite words ranks as the third category. This refers to the conventional norms of educational and social contexts where students are expected to remain within bounds of modesty in their speech. Bad language, harsh words, cursing, and offensive language are some of the instances of this category. From Table 2, it can be seen that out of 192 codes, 31 refer to the use of appropriate language in the class, with an equal distribution among both males and females.

Category four: Interrupting professors' speech. Interrupting professors' speech is the fourth theme of verbal academic offensive behavior. This refers to times when instructors are interrupted by students while teaching or even speaking in the class. Out of 192 cases, 21 cases refer to speaking in the middle of instructors' speech. According to Table 2, there is a little difference among males (9 cases) and females (12 cases) in their choice of this category.

Category five: Talking loud with the professors. Talking loud with the professors is another theme of incivility in educational context. Participants posited that speaking with a high and loud voice with instructors is a sign of impoliteness. According to Table 2, 20 codes are expressed under this category. In contrast to the previous category attracting an equal number of males and females, speaking with a loud voice was mainly expressed by a great number of females (17 cases) than males (3 cases).

Category six: Talking behind professors' backs. Talking behind professors' back is another sign of incivility. It is defined as defaming teachers, spreading rumors and gossiping about teachers, judging teachers based on hearsay evidence, or any further act similar to spreading slander about university instructors. According to Table 3, males (10 cases) expressed more concerns regarding this behavior than females (8 cases).

Category seven: Asking inappropriate personal and irrelevant questions. Asking inappropriate personal and irrelevant questions stands as the last impolite behavior among university students towards teachers. It refers to those instances when students try to evade lessons by asking teachers personal questions. Those questions can include a wide range of inappropriate queries about a teacher's life, likes and dislikes, marital status, income, etc., making the teacher and some of the students uncomfortable during the class. From Table 2, it can be seen that asking awkward questions of teachers is expressed as an unjustified behavior more by males (6 cases) than females (3 cases).

Students' verbal and non-verbal academic impoliteness. The last category of students' academic disrespectful behavior includes a combination of both verbal and non-verbal behaviors. In fact, it refers to any inappropriate behavior that is expressed through the application of linguistic and non-linguistic signs and includes only one category.

Joking with the students and instructors in the class. Joking with the students and instructors in the class is the only collective impolite behavior that can be expressed both verbally and non-verbally or even the combination of the two (73 cases). It can cover a wide range of actions, such as imitating and mocking teachers' and other students' voices, speech, styles, gestures, faces, clothes, names, etc. Furthermore, students use conversation as a way of distracting attention from lessons, and any signs of jocularity in their tone are also believed to be a sign of incivility. According to Table 3, this behavior was expressed more by males (53.42%) than females (46.57%).

Students' Perception towards Teachers' Academic Impoliteness

A total number of 738 codes were emerged expressing university instructors' impolite behavior and are accordingly grouped into three categories: non-verbal (250 cases), verbal (126 cases), and verbal and non-verbal (362 cases).

Teachers' Non-verbal Academic Impoliteness. Non-verbal cases refer to those teachers' behaviors that are seen as disrespectful by students. Seven subcategories emerged from 250 cases.

Category one: Lack of attention. Lack of attention is one of the first and most immediate signs of teachers' academic uncivil behavior. According to Table 4, 141 cases include a number of factors ranging from "ignoring students' opinions" (46 cases), "absence without prior notice' (25 cases), followed by "the mismatch between teaching and testing" (16 cases), and "rejecting criticisms" (14 cases). Also, there are other sources of teachers' ignorance such as "coming late to the class" (13 cases), "too many absences" (12 cases), "leaving the class early," "inattention to students' class activities" (6 cases), and finally "not recording students' attendance in the classroom" (3 cases).

Category two: Discrimination among students. Discrimination among students ranks as the second immediate source of non-verbal impolite behaviors. It refers to teachers' unfair treatment between male and female students. In addition, it also refers to discrimination among students of the same gender. This category covers a vast number of items such as inequitable distribution of grade among students, giving unequal power to students, devoting inadequate attention to some of students' opinions, etc. As it can be seen from Table 4, 37 out of 250 codes are expressed in relation to teachers' unjust actions in the class. What is interesting is that males (24 codes) are more concerned than females (13 codes) about discrimination.

Category three: Using a cellphone in the classroom. Using a cellphone in the classroom is the third category of teachers' improper behavior. As the name suggests, it refers to teachers' use of cellphones to call, text, play, or do any other activities beyond the educational realm. According to Table 4, 33 out of 250 cases argue that the use of a cell phone is not appropriate in the classroom. Similar to the previous category, males (21 codes) expressed more concerns regarding this behavior than females (12 codes).

Category four: Eating and drinking in the classroom. Eating and drinking in the classroom is the next category and refers to instances when teachers eat, drink, or chew gum in the class while teaching. From Table 4, it can be observed that 15 cases are related to this theme, with a slightly higher males' choice (15 cases) than females (9 cases).

Category five: Ignoring ethical and moral values. Ignoring ethical and moral values is the least important theme of teachers' impoliteness. Students maintain that teachers' attempts to establish any relationship with students beyond the teacher-student relationship is highly inappropriate and is not acceptable among students. Although only 15 codes were mentioned under this category, a rather similar distribution between females (6 codes) and males (9 codes) was found.

Teachers' verbal academic impoliteness. Verbal impoliteness includes inappropriate spoken language conveying offense in academic contexts. A total number of 126 cases emerged and were accordingly put into four subcategories.

Category one: Lack of modesty in speech and using impolite words. Lack of modesty in speech and using impolite words is the most central verbal impolite behavior. It claims that teachers are expected to use polite language, courteous expressions, deferential speech, etc. Teachers' use of bad language is highly criticized and should be avoided as it is one of the serious

Table 5
Distribution of Teachers' Verbal Academic Impolite Behavior among Both Genders

Spoken or Verbal		Female		Male		Total	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Lack of modesty in speech and using impolite words	14	21.21	52	78.78	66	100
2	Teachers' self-infatuation and self-praise	11	37.93	18	62.06	29	100
3	Breached confidentiality	5	26.31	14	73.68	19	100
4	Joking with the students	6	50	6	50	12	100
	Total	36	28.57	90	71.42	126	100

Table 6
Distribution of Teachers' Verbal and Non-Verbal Academic Impolite Behavior among Both Genders

Verbal and Behavioral			Female		Male		Total	
			F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Insulting and Mocking	Insulting students' race, ethnicity, language, culture, city, name, etc.	16	33.33	32	66.66	48	100
		Mocking students' because of not learning the lesson	10	25	30	75	40	100
		Forcing the students to leave the classroom	9	50	9	50	18	100
		Make fun of students' academic field	0	0	8	100	8	100
		Laugh at students' questions in class and mock them	2	28.57	5	71.42	7	100
		Total	37	30.57	84	69.42	121	100
2	Teacher to Teacher	Questioning other teachers' method of teaching	25	35.71	45	64.28	70	100
		Feeling superior to other teachers	6	50	6	50	12	100
		Lack of friendly behavior with other teachers	1	14.28	6	85.71	7	100
		Mocking other professors' beliefs and viewpoints	1	16.66	5	83.33	6	100
		Total	33	34.73	62	65.26	95	100
3	Negligence	Ignoring students questions in class	10	25.64	29	74.35	39	100
		Professor's negligence and avoidance teaching	17	62.96	10	37.03	27	100
		Wasting the time of the class	6	37.5	10	62.5	16	100
		Total	33	40.24	49	59.75	82	100
4	Professor's loss of temper		9	29.03	22	70.96	31	100
5	Lack of friendly manner and extreme strictness		6	35.29	11	64.70	17	100
6	Clinging to non-academic distracters		11	68.75	5	31.25	16	100
	Total		129	35.63	233	64.36	362	

sources of verbal impoliteness in academic contexts. Table 4 presents an overview of the distribution of this category. As it can be seen from the table, 66 codes out of 126 cases refer to speech modesty. A highly noticeable difference among gender is the high number of cases of speech modesty expressed by males (52 codes) compared to females (14 codes).

Category two: Teachers' self-infatuation and self-praise. Teachers' self-infatuation and self-praise ranks as the second verbal rude behavior from the teachers' side. These are generally those university instructors who consistently praise themselves, admire their skills, and are proud of themselves. It is apparent from this table that few (29 codes), with a rather different

distribution among females (11 codes) and males (18 codes), refer to this type of academic impolite behavior.

Category three: Breaching confidentiality. Breaching confidentiality is the third component of teachers' verbal impoliteness. This means that teachers are expected to ensure that strict confidentiality regarding students' personal lives is maintained in all respects. In fact, students posited that teachers are assumed to be very good at keeping secrets. Table 4 shows that 19 cases refer to such a claim. The most striking result to emerge from the data is that males (14 codes) are more concerned about the issue of confidentiality than females are (5 codes).

Category four: Joking with students. Joking with students is the last expressed component of teachers' verbal academic impoliteness. This is the situation when teachers make fun of students, mock their names, laugh at their lifestyles or their ethnicity, etc. From Table 4, we can see that 12 codes with similar distributions between females and males are reported as this type of incivility.

Teachers' verbal and non-verbal academic impoliteness. Seven categories of teachers' verbal and non-verbal academic impoliteness emerged from 362 codes. Each is discussed below.

Category one: Insulting and mocking. Insulting and mocking is the first identified impolite behavior which can be exhibited both verbally and non-verbally. A general examination of this category from Table 5 shows that 121 out of 362 codes of verbal and non-verbal impoliteness are expressed in relation to teachers' offensive and disrespectful behavior and speech with students at universities. The results obtained from the preliminary analysis of the data indicated that this category was mainly dominated by male participants (84 codes) as opposed to females (37 codes). According to Table 6, five subcategories emerged from the analysis of this category, demonstrating that it is associated with "insulting others' culture, city, race, name, etc. (48 cases); "humiliating students because of not learning the lesson" (40 cases), "forcing students to leave the classroom' (18 cases), "making use [sic] of students' academic field" (8 cases), and finally, "laughing at students' question in class" (7 cases).

Category two: Teacher to teacher impoliteness. Teacher to teacher impoliteness is the next important theme of disrespectful behavior. It is any insolent behavior that might be performed by teachers in relation to other teachers. Ninety-five codes were gathered with a noticeably different distribution among females (33 codes) and males (62 codes). From Table 6, we can see that four subcategories emerged from the data: "questioning other teachers' method of teaching" (70 codes), "feeling superior to other teachers" (12 codes), "lack of friendly behavior with other teachers" (7 codes), and finally, "mocking other teachers' belief and viewpoints" (6 codes).

Category three: Negligence. Negligence is the third category of impolite actions. A total number of 82 codes emerged and were similar to the two previous categories: males (49 codes) tend to choose this theme more than females (33 codes). The gathered codes were put into four subgroups to cover a wide range of issues: "ignoring students' questions in class" (39 codes), "teachers' avoidance of teaching" (27 codes), and finally, "wasting the time of the class" (16 codes).

Category four: Teachers' loss of temper. Teachers' loss of temper ranks as the fourth category of ill-formed manners. Students mentioned that university instructors are highly expected to control their anger and remain calm in any challenging situations. According to Table 6, from 31 comments addressed under this category, 22 were by males; whereas, only 9 were by females.

Category five: Lack of friendly manner and extreme strictness. Lack of friendly manner and extreme strictness is the fifth category and mainly refers to teachers' excessive seriousness in class, making teaching and learning insufferable. Table 6 represents that the lack of a good and amiable behavior with students is expressed with 17 codes in which 6 females and 11 males commented about this classification.

Category six: Clinging to non-academic distractors. Clinging to non-academic distractors stands as the last category of rudeness, which is basically the notion of discussing marginal and peripheral topics in the class. In fact, devoting class time to any issue except the lesson is seen as a case of academic impoliteness. A very noticeable result from Table 6 is that, in contrast to many cases, those 16 collected codes are unequally chosen by more females (11 codes) than males (5 codes).

Discussion

The primary aim of this work was to examine Iranian university students' perception towards university students' and instructors' academic impoliteness. According to the study, disrespectful behavior in academic contexts is divided into three categories, namely verbal, non-verbal, and a combination of the two. Confusion existed in the literature as to what exactly constitutes classroom incivility, as well as the rate of incidence of such acts (Boice, 1996; Caboni, Hirschy, & Best, 2004; Twale & Deluca, 2008). Therefore, the findings of this study support the literature. Each is discussed below regarding its consistency, if any, with previous studies.

Students' Academic Impoliteness

Regarding students' perception towards university students' incivility, the study demonstrates that verbal

or non-verbal impoliteness, or the combination of the two, can cause discourtesies in academic contexts. The emergent cases of academic impoliteness in the current study are compatible with the literature.

In line with the literature, the first uncivil non-spoken behavior was found to be lack of attention to teacher, lesson, class, and assignment; lack of prior preparation (Appleby, 1990; Kearney & Plax, 1992; Royce, 2000); lack of punctuality in coming to class late or after the teacher (Appleby, 1990; Bjorklund & Rehling, 2010, Boice, 1996 , 2000; Feldman, 2001; Hernandez & Fister, 2001; Meyers, 2003; Kearney & Plax, 1992; Royce, 2000; Seidman, 2005); lack of attention to the teacher while teaching (Boice, 1996; Feldman, 2001; Hernandez & Fister, 2001; Meyers, 2003; Royce, 2000; Seidman, 2005); loud conversations during class (Boice, 1996, 2000; Fernandez-Balboa, 1991), and early departure from the class without teachers' permission (Bjorklund & Rehling, 2010; Boice, 1996; Clark & Springer, 2007a; Feldman, 2001; Hernandez & Fister, 2001; Meyers, 2003; Seidman, 2005; Royce, 2000).

Other mentioned cases of behavioral academic impoliteness were using a cell phone (Boice, 1996; Bjorklund & Rehling, 2010; Feldman, 2001; Hernandez & Fister, 2001; Jere, 2015; McKinne, 2008; Meyers, 2003; Seidman, 2005; Royce, 2000); wearing inappropriate dress, which has been previously referred to as an annoyance by Feldman (2001); yawning and sleeping in class (Boice, 1996; Clark, Otterness, Alerton, & Black, 2010; Feldman, 2001; Hernandez & Fister, 2001; Meyers, 2003; Seidman, 2005; Royce, 2000); and ignoring ethical and moral values by such actions as sending inappropriate emails to teachers (Royce, 2000), and displaying disrespectful nonverbal behaviors (Clark & Springer, 2007).

Consistent with the previous data, the second group of incivilities are those that are verbally committed: for example, talking in the class (Feldman 2001; Jere, 2015; McKinne, 2008; Royce, 2000) and joking with the professors and other students (Alberts et al., 2010; Boice, 1996, 2000; Feldman, 2001; Hernandez & Fister, 2001; Jere, 2015; McKinne, 2008, Meyers, 2003; Seidman, 2005). In addition, lack of modesty in speech and using impolite words have also been identified as academic incivility among Iranian university students. Many scholars found similar conclusions with their research: that making vulgar comments to the teachers (Royce, 2000) and insulting and stalking instructors (Boice, 1996; Feldman, 2001; Hernandez & Fister, 2001; Meyers, 2003; Seidman, 2005) are assumed to be signs of disrespectful behavior. Moreover, talking loudly with the professor was constantly expressed as insufferable rudeness by the participants of the current study and was comparable to what has been claimed in the literature. For instance, violence in speech (Boice, 1996; Feldman, 200; Feldman; Hernandez & Fister 2001,), threats of violence, as well as attacking instructors verbally (Bjorklund & Rehling, 2010; Boice, 1996; Feldman, 2001; Hernandez & Fister, 2001; Meyers, 2003; Seidman, 2005), have been identified earlier.

Most importantly, the findings of this study support Royce's (2000) results by documenting that any verbal or non-verbal sarcastic speech, gestures, or remarks are highly perceived as improper behavior at universities.

Teachers' Academic Impoliteness

Although some research has been done on the students' ill-mannered behavior in the higher educational environment (Boice, 1996; McKinne, 2008), there is no reported research about teachers' incivility, especially in Iranian contexts. Only a very limited number of studies (Boice, 1996; Tantleff-Dunn, Dunn, & Gokee, 2002) have been conducted regarding this construct. The present study showed that, similar to students' incivility, teachers' improper actions in educational contexts are also divided into three categories: verbal, non-verbal, and a combination of the two. A thorough exploration of the literature indicates that some of the discovered instances of teachers' impoliteness have been previously proposed, while some were not. For example, and compatible with the literature, the first category of behavioral incivility includes ignoring students' opinions, being absent without prior notice, mismatching between teaching and testing, and arriving late to class (Boice, 1996, 2000; Tantleff-Dunn et al., 2002).

However, regarding teachers' incivility, the present study also declared that Iranian university students believed that rejecting criticism, too many absences, leaving the classroom early, inattention to students' activities in classroom, and lack of recording student class attendance are among teachers' behavioral academic impolitenesses which were not previously declared in literature.

The study also illustrates some teachers' verbal incivilities, such as professor's low academic knowledge (Boice, 1996; Hannah, 2006; Oblinger, 2003) and inability to control a class (McKinne 2008), which is compatible with the previous studies. However, the participants of the current study reported some teachers' verbal academic impoliteness, which were not noticeably stated in literature, e.g., discrimination among students, using cellphone in the classroom, eating and drinking in the classroom, and ignoring ethical and moral values.

Finally, the third group of teachers' uncivil actions are those that can be both verbal and no-verbal. Among the four cases, only joking with the students has been formerly declared by Boice (1996, 2000), and the other three—namely, lack of modesty in speech and use of

impolite words, teachers' self-infatuation and self-praise, and teacher-breached confidentiality—were just mentioned by Iranian university students.

Conclusion

Academic impoliteness, undoubtedly, takes many forms and can be committed by both teachers and students. Providing a rigid description for incivility depends highly on the extent to which the behavior is disruptive in educational contexts. As result, some behaviors, such as talking on the phone and sleeping in class, were perceived as less serious or mild incivility (Connelly, 2009); whereas, some actions, including threatening teachers or other students (Clark, 2008; Royce, 2000), were reported as serious instances of incivility.

The current study aimed at proving an awareness regarding the existence of academic impoliteness in educational contexts which is committed, not only by the students, but also the teachers. In addition, this work introduced a group of frequent and common instances of improper behavior to students and instructors which might help them resist committing them. Furthermore, taking into account the strong debate regarding identification of incivility (Hernandez & Fister, 2001; Seidman, 2005), the study pointed toward the requirement of collaboration (Bruffee, 1999) between instructors and students to address academic impoliteness. This study can also contribute to an effective teaching environment as teachers might think more about their performance (Hannah, 1996; Twale & Deluca, 2008) and adopt more creative teaching strategies to be effective for a wide range of learners (Hannah, 2006).

A final word is that similar studies can be conducted to investigate how both teachers and students perceive university instructors' and students' academic incivility, not only in one nation, but in multiple nations, and they can provide cultural comparisons. This might eventually help researchers to come up with at least a series of agreed upon cases of academic impoliteness at the higher educational level which can be introduced to teachers and students. This awareness might help them decrease the chances of committing such behaviors by being more cautious.

References

Alberts, H. C., Hazen, H. D., & Theobald, R. B. (2010). Classroom incivilities: The challenge of interactions between college students and instructors in the US. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 34,* 439-462.

Andersson, L., & Pearson, C. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review 24*(3), 452–471.

Appleby, D. C. (1990). Faculty and student perceptions of irritating behaviors in the college classroom. *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development, 8,* 41-46.

Archer, D. (2011). Cross-examining lawyers, facework and the adversarial courtroom. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(13), 3216-3230.

Aronson, K., & Rundstrom, B. (1989). Cats, dogs, and sweets in the clinical negotiation of reality: on politeness and coherence in pediatric discourse, *Language in Society, 18*, 483-504.

Ausbrooks, A. R., Jones, S. H., & Tijerina, M. S. (2011). Now you see it, now you don't: Faculty student perceptions of classroom incivility in a social work program. *Advances in Social Work, 12*(2), 255-275.

Austin, P. (1990). Politeness revisited—the dark side. In A. Bell & J. Holmes (Eds.), *New Zealand ways of speaking English* (pp. 277–293). Wellington, NZ: Victoria University Press.

Baldwin, R. G. (1997-98). Academic civility begins in the classroom. *Essays on teaching excellence, 9*(8), 1-2.

Beebe, L. M. (1995). Polite fictions: Instrumental rudeness as pragmatic competence. In J. E. Alatis & C. Straehle (Eds.), *Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics* (pp. 154-168). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Berger, B. A. (2000). Incivility. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 64,* 445-450.

Bjorklund, W. L., & Rehling, D. L. (2010). Student perceptions of classroom incivility. *College Teaching*, 58, 15-18.

Boice, B. (1996). Classroom incivilities. *Research in Higher Education, 37*(4), 453-486.

Boice, R. (2000). *Advice for new faculty members.* Needham Heights, MA: Pearson Education.

Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in interaction*. Amsterdam, NL: Benjamins.

Braxton, J. M., & Bayer, A. E. (1999). *Faculty misconduct in collegiate teaching*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Braxton, J. M., Bayer, A. E., & Noseworthy, J. A. (2004). The influence of teaching norm violations on the welfare of students as clients of college teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 99,* 41-46.

Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1989). Politeness theory and Shakespeare's four major tragedies. *Language in Society*, *18*, 159–212.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bruffee, K. A. (1999). *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Caboni, T. C., Hirschy, A. S., & Best, J .A. (2004). Student norms of classroom decorum. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 99*, 59-66.

Center for Survey Research. (2000). *A survey on academic incivility at Indiana University: Preliminary report*. Retrieved from http://www.indiana.edu/~csr/Civility%20PreReport.pdf

Chejnová, P. (2014). Expressing politeness in the institutional e-mail communications of university students in the Czech Republic. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *60*, 175-192.

Cheng, W. (2003) *Intercultural conversation.* Amsterdam, NL: Benjamins.

Chick, J. K. (1996) Intercultural communication. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp.329-348). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, C. M. (2008). Faculty and student assessment and experience with incivility in nursing education: A national perspective. *Journal of Nursing Education, 47*(10), 458-465.

Clark, C. M., & Carnosso, J. (2008). Civility: A concept analysis. *The Journal of Theory Construction and Testing, 12*(1), 11-15.

Clark, C., Otterness, N., Alerton, B., & Black, M. (2010). Descriptive study of student incivility in the People's Republic of China. *Journal of Cultural Diversity, 17*, 136-143.

Clark, C. M., Juan, C. M., Allerton, B. W., Otterness, N. S., Jun, W. Y., & Wei, F. (2012).Faculty and student perceptions of academic incivility in the Peoples' Republic of China. *Journal of Cultural Diversity, 19*(3), 85-93.

Clark, C. M., & Kenaley, B. L. D. (2011). Faculty empowerment of students to foster civility in nursing education: A merging of two conceptual models. *Nursing Outlook*, *59*(3), 158-165. doi:10.1016/j.outlook.2010.12.005

Clark, C. M., & Springer, P.J. (2007). Incivility in nursing education: A descriptive study on definitions and prevalence. *Journal of Nursing Education, 47*(1), 714.

Connelly, R. (2009). Introducing a culture of civility in first-year college classes. *The Journal of General Education*, *58*(1), 2-8.

Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 25*, 349-367.

Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The weakest link. *Journal of Politeness Research, 1*(1), 35-72.

Culpeper, J. (2010). Conventionalized impoliteness formulae. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*, 3232-3245.

Eelen, G. (2001). *A critique of politeness theories.* Manchester, UK: St. Jerome's Press.

Ermida, I. (2006). Linguistic mechanisms of power in Nineteen Eighty-Four: Applying politeness theory to Orwell's world. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *38*, 842–862.

Feldmann, L. J. (2001). Classroom civility is another of our instructor responsibilities. *College Teaching, 49,* 137-140.

Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. (1991). Helping novice teachers handle discipline problems, *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, *62*, 50-54.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (6th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Gilroy, M. (2008). Colleges grappling with Incivility. *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education, 18*(19), 8-9.

Given**,** L. M (2008). *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Goffman, E. (1967) *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior.* New York, NY: Academic Press.

Gonzales, V., & Lopez, E. (2001). The age of incivility: Countering disruptive behavior in the classroom. *AAHE Bulletin, 55*(8), 3-6.

Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H (1990). Interstitial argument. In A. D. Grimshaw (Ed.), *Conflict talk: Sociolinguistic investigations of arguments and conversations* (pp. 85-117). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gough, D. H. (1995) Some problems for Politeness Theory: Deference and directness in Xhosa performative requests. *South African Journal of African languages, 15*(3), 123-125.

Hannah, M. (2006). *Reflections on Bob Boice's "classroom incivilities"* (University Of Colorado at Boulder). Retrieved from https://www.colorado.edu/ftep/reflections-bob-boices-classroom-incivilities

Harris, S. (2001) Being politically impolite: Extending Politeness Theory to adversarial political discourse. *Discourse and Society, 12*, 451-472.

Hernandez, T. J., & Fister, D. L. (2001). Dealing with disruptive and emotional college students: A systems model. *Journal of College Counseling, 4,* 49-62.

Hutchby, I. (1996). Confrontation talk: Arguments, asymmetries, and power on talk radio. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ige, B. (2001) *Gendering politeness. Speech and act among Zulu second language speakers of the English language on the Durban Campus* (Unpublished Master's thesis). University of Natal, Durban, SA.

Jamet, D., & Jobert, M. (2013). *Aspects of linguistic impoliteness.* Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing/

Jere, N. (2015). Student-teachers' perception of incivility: The case of a college of education in north-central Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal, 11* (25), 1857 – 7881.

Kasper, G. (1990) Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*, 193-218.

Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (1992). Student resistance to control. In V. P. Richmond & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Power in the classroom: Communication, control, and concern* (pp. 85-100). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Knepp, K. A. F. (2012). Understanding student and faculty incivility in higher education. *The Journal of Effective Teaching, 12*(1), 32-45.

Lachenicht, L. G. (1980). Aggravating language: A study of abusive and insulting language. *International Journal of Human Communication, 13*(4), 607–688.

Lakoff, R. (1989). The limits of politeness: Therapeutic and courtroom discourse. *Multilingua, 8*, 101-129.

Leatherman, C. (1996). Whatever happened to civility in academe? *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *42*(26), A21.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London, UK: Longman.

Limberg, H. (2009). Impoliteness and threat responses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *41*(7), 1376-1394.

Luparell, S. (2003). *Critical incidents of incivility by nursing students: How uncivil encounters with students affect nursing faculty* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

McKinne, M. (2008). *A quantitative and qualitative inquiry into classroom incivility in higher education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri, Columbia.

Metthias, N. W. (2011). Impoliteness or underpoliteness: An analysis of a Christmas dinner scene from Dickens' Great Expectations. *Journal of King Saud University, Languages and Translation*, *23*(1), 11-18.

Mirhaghi, R. M., & Shomoossi, N. (2015). Selfassertiveness interfacing incivility in student nurses: Possible outcomes. *Nurse Education Today, 35*(10), e6.

Myers, G. (1989). The pragmatics of politeness in scientific articles. *Applied Linguistics*, *10*(1), 1-35.

Meyers, S. A (2003). Strategies to prevent and reduce conflict in college classrooms. *College Classrooms, 51*(3), 94-98.

Nordstrom, C. R., Bartels, L. K., & Bucy, J. (2009). Predicting and curbing classroom incivility in higher education. *College Student Journal, 43,* 74-85.

Oblinger, D. (2003). Boomers, gen x-ers and millenials: Understanding the new students. *Educause, 38*(4)*,* 36-47.

Peck, D. L. (2002). Civility: A contemporary context for a meaningful historical concept. *Sociological Inquir*y, *72*(3), 358 – 375.

Penman, R. (1990). Facework and politeness: Multiple goals in courtroom discourse. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology 9*, 15–38.

Robertson J. E. (2012). Can't we all just get along? A primer on student incivility in nursing education. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 33*, 21-6.

Royce, A. (2000). *A survey of academic incivility at Indiana University: Preliminary report*. Bloomington, IN: Center for Survey Research.

Schneider, A. (1998). Insubordination and intimidation signal the end of decorum in many classrooms. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 44*(29), A12-A14.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (1995) *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Seidman, A. (2005). The learning killer: Disruptive student behavior in the classroom. *Reading Improvement, 42,* 40-66.

Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge, UK: University ofCambridge Press.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strecker, I. (1993) Cultural variations in the concept of face. *Multilingua, 12*(2), 119-141.

Tannen, D. (1990) *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation.* New York, NY: William Morrow.

Tantleff-Dunn, S., Dunn, M. E., & Gokee, J. L. (2002). Understanding faculty-student conflict: Student perceptions of precipitating events and faculty responses. *Teaching of Psychology, 29,* 197-202.

Thomas, S. P. (2003). Handling anger in the teacher-student relationship. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, *24*(1), 17-24.

Turner, K. (1996). The principal principles of pragmatic inference: Politeness. *Language Teaching, 29*(1), 1–13.

Twale, D. J., & DeLuca, B. M. (2008) *Faculty incivility: The rise of the academic bully culture and what to do about it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Vuchinich, S. (1990). The sequential organization of closing in verbal family conflict. In A. D. Grimshaw (Ed.), *Conflict talk: Sociolinguistic Investigations of arguments and conversations* (pp. 118–138). Cambridge, UK: University Press.

Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wei, F. (2010). Descriptive study of student incivility in the People's Republic of China*, Journal of Cultural Diversity*, *17*(4), 136–150.

Wolf, C. (2011). Sunday dialogue: Anonymity and incivility on the internet. Letter to the Editor of the New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/27/opinion/sund

ay/sunday-dialogue-anonymity-and-incivility-on-the-internet.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

MOHAMMAD ALIAKBARI is a full professor in English Department School of Humanities in Ilam University in IRAN. He is currently the president of Ilam University. He has published more than 100 papers related to the field of ELT, TEFOL, Teacher Training, Teacher Education, Contrastive Analysis, etc. and he has attended more than 50 seminars. He has been the head of faculty, head of the English department, university vice chancellor for educational affairs, dean for educational affairs as well as instructor. He has guided many MA and PhD thesis and dissertations.

ANNA HAJIZADEH is a PhD candidate in the field of TEFOL in Ilam University. She is currently working on her dissertation about English language teacher training and teacher development. She is currently a university lecturer teaching to the university students in the field of English language teaching and translation. She has published five articles.